APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,888	03/31/2004	Mihai Florin Ionescu	24207-10109	5760

62296   7590   12/17/2007

GOOGLE / FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA ST.
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
LE, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 November 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-12,15-24,26-35 and 38-49</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-12,15-24,26-35 and 38-49</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Summary and Status of Claims

1.   This Office Action is in response to Applicant's reply filed November 29, 2007.

2.   Claims 13, 14, 36 and 37 are cancelled.

3.   Claims 1, 3-12, 15-24, 26-35 and 38-49 are pending.

4.   Claims 1, 3-12, 15, 16, 18, 20-24, 26-35, 38, 39, 41, 43-46, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub 2005/0033803) of record, in view of Rivette et al. (US Patent 5,806,079) of record.

5.   Claims 17 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub 2005/0033803) of record, in view of Rivette et al. (US Patent 5,806,079) of record, further in view of Fox (US Patent 5,765,172) of record.

6.   Claims 19 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub 2005/0033803) of record, in view of Rivette et al. (US Patent 5,806,079) of record, further in view of Darago et al. (US Patent 6,170,014) of record.

7.   Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub 2005/0033803) of record, in view of Rivette et al. (US Patent 5,806,079) of record, further in view of Fox (US Patent 5,765,172) of record, further in view of Darago et al. (US Patent 6,170,014) of record.

8.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   Claims 1, 3-12, 15, 16, 18, 20-24, 26-35, 38, 39, 41, 43-46, 48 and 49 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub

2005/0033803) of record, hereinafter "Vleet", in view of Rivette et al. (US Patent 5,806,079)

of record, hereinafter "Rivette".

10.   In regards to **claim 1**, Vleet discloses a method comprising:

a.   providing a data store of stored events, wherein the events comprise data

describing user interactions with articles (Vleet at para. 0023), wherein the articles are

associated with a plurality of different applications (Vleet at para. 0024, lines 14-22);

b.   providing an index of the stored event, wherein the index is a part of the data store

(Vleet at para. 0026, lines 18-23);

c.   mirroring the data store, including the index, to another storage medium. Vleet at

para. 0034.

11.   Vleet does not expressly disclose identifying a desired portion of the data store for

replication, the desired portion including articles relevant to a search query and a portion of the

index, the identifying comprising:

a.   identifying a first result set of articles relevant to the search query;

b.   identifying frequently occurring items within the first result set of articles; and

c.   identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently

occurring terms;

and replicating the desired portion of the data store, after which the replicated portion is

stored on a storage medium. Vleet does disclose mirroring. Vleet at para. 0034.

12.   Rivette discloses a database system that stores notes, which are indications of a user's activity with articles (such a spreadsheets, documents, etc.,), that allows a user to select a portion of the database to be replicated to another database. Rivette at col. 21, lines 4-36. Rivette discloses the feature where the user is permitted to search and identify note groupings, notes, sub-notes, and data object portions. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9. Rivette discloses searching capabilities of the system allowing a user to search for notes, subnotes, links and data objects. Rivette at col. 24, lines 54-67. Rivette discloses the structure of notes and sub-notes. In particular, Rivette discloses that sub-notes are created and defined by a user and that there can be multiple sub-notes linked to a data object. Rivette at col. 12, lines 24-7. In addition, Rivette discloses that a user can search for sub-notes. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9. Rivette discloses allowing a user to search using multiple iteration or recursive search. Rivette at col. 36, lines 21-6.

13.   Vleet and Rivette are analogous art because they are directed to the same field of endeavor of database management.

14.   At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Vleet by adding the steps of identifying a desired portion of the data store for replication, the desired portion including articles relevant to a search query and a portion of the index, the identifying comprising:

    a.   identifying a first result set of articles relevant to the search query;

    b.   identifying frequently occurring items within the first result set of articles; and

    c.   identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently occurring terms;

and replicating the desired portion of the data store, after which the replicated portion is stored on a storage medium, as taught by Rivette.

15.   The motivation for doing so would have been because it is efficient to use portions of an existing database that may be relevant for another project at another database. Rivette at col. 21, lines 8-10.

16.   In regards to **claim 3**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the index comprises a plurality of terms associated with the events. Vleet at para. 0026, lines 18-23.

17.   In regards to **claim 4**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the index comprises one or combination of one or more times, one or more types, one or more locations, one or more articles, or one or more user activities associated with the events. Vleet at para. 0026, lines 18-23.[1]

18.   In regards to **claim 5**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 4, wherein the articles comprise one or a combination of word processor documents, spreadsheet documents, presentation documents, emails, instant messenger messages, database entries, calendar entries, appointment entries, task manager entries, source code files, web pages, Portable Document Format (PDF) files, media files, audio files, or video files. Vleet at para. 0026, lines 11-17; Rivette at col. 5, lines 56-67.

19.   In regards to **claim 6**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the data store comprises a database. Vleet at para. 0026, lines 1-3; Rivette at col. 8, lines 44-9.

---

[1] The index permits retrieval based on "general event type", which is interpreted as one type.

20.   In regards to **claim 7**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 6, wherein the database comprises events. Vleet at para. 0026; Rivette at col. 5, lines 56-67; col. 8, lines 58-62.

21.   In regards to **claim 8**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the data store comprises a repository. Vleet at para. 0026; Rivette at col. 8, lines 58-62.

22.   In regards to **claim 9**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 8, wherein the repository comprises content associated with the articles. Vleet at para. 0026; Rivette at col. 8, lines 47-49, 58-62.

23.   In regards to **claim 10**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein identifying a desired portion of the data store comprises presenting a user with a graphical user interface. Rivette at col. 21, lines 4-36, 38-9.

24.   In regards to **claim 11**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein identifying a desired portion of the data store comprises presenting a user with suggested events. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9.

25.   In regards to **claim 12**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein identifying a desired portion of the data store comprises identifying frequently accessed articles. Rivette at col. 12, lines 14-27; col. 21, lines 26-9; col. 24, lines 53-67.[2]

26.   In regards to **claim 15**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, further comprising determining a maximum size for a replicated portion of the data store. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9, 33-6; col. 24, lines 64-7.[3]

---

[2] A user can search the database for notes or sub-notes based on various types of criteria. Notes represent links to data objects and sub-notes represent portions of data objects and are created each time a user accesses a data object or a particular portion of a data object. Thus, it is interpreted that a user can search the database for a group of sub-notes that represent a frequently accessed data object.

27.   In regards to **claim 16**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein

identifying a desired portion of the data store comprises determining recently accessed articles.

Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9, 33-6; col. 24, lines 53-67.

28.   In regards to **claim 18**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, further

comprising determining profile information associated with the desired portion, the profile

information identifying a user associated with the data store. Rivette at col. 21, lines 33-6.[4]

29.   In regards to **claim 20**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the

desired portion of the data store is replicated to a removable data store. Rivette at col. 9, lines

58-61.

30.   In regards to **claim 21**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 20, wherein the

data store is a local data store on a client device. Rivette at col. 9, lines 3-7.

31.   In regards to **claim 22**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the

desired portion of the data store is replicated to a second data store located on a network. Rivette

at col. 9, lines 53-7; col. 10, lines 18-22.

32.   In regards to **claim 23**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 22, wherein the

data store is a local data store on a client device. Rivette at col. 9, lines 3-7.

33.   **Claims 24 and 26-35, 38, 39, 41 and 43-46** are essentially claims 1 and 3-12, 15, 16, 18

and 20-23 in the form of a computer readable storage medium containing program code and are

therefore rejected for the same reasons.

---

[3] "A user can limit the search to a user-defined path..." is interpreted as "determining a maximum size for a
replicated portion..."
[4] Searching can be performed on "creator", which is interpreted as identifying a user associated with the data store.

34.   In regards to **claim 48**, Vleet and Rivette disclose the method of claim 18, wherein the

profile information is replicated with the desired portion of the data store and further comprising:

a.   providing a second data store of stored events, the second data store having

associated profile information identifying a second user associated with the second data

store (Rivette at col. 9, lines 54-6);

b.   identifying articles associated with the stored events in the replicated portion

(Rivette at col. 18, lines 39-42) and articles associated with the stored events in the

second data store related to a search query (Rivette at col. 24, lines 54-67);

c.   simultaneously displaying the identified articles associated with the events stored

in the replicated portion and the second data store (Rivette at col. 18, lines 39-49); and

d.   displaying profile information corresponding to each identified article, the profile

information identifying the user associated with the data store storing the event with

which the article is associated. Rivette at col. 24, lines 54-67.[5]

35.   **Claim 49** is essentially claim 48 in the form of a computer readable storage medium and

therefore is rejected for the same reasons.

36.   **Claims 17 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub 2005/0033803) of record, hereinafter "Vleet", in view of Rivette

et al. (US Patent 5,806,079) of record, hereinafter "Rivette", further in view of Fox (US

Patent 5,765,172) of record.

---

[5] It is interpreted that since a user can search for notes (events) based on creator or owner (user associated with data store storing the event), then the results (identified article) include the corresponding creator/owner (profile information).

37.   In regards to **claim 17**, Vleet and Rivette do not expressly disclose the method of claim 8, further comprising determining a checksum associated with the index and the repository.

38.   Fox discloses determining a checksum value for a first database in order to verify the integrity of a replicated database. Fox at col. 1, lines 65-7; col. 2, lines 1-6.

39.   Vleet, Rivette and Fox are analogous art because they are directed to the same field of endeavor of database management.

40.   At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined method of Vleet and Rivette by adding the step of determining a checksum associated with the index and the repository, as taught by Fox.

41.   The motivation for doing so would have been because determining checksums for replicated databases allows for ensuring data integrity after the replication. Fox at col. 1, lines 65-7.

42.   **Claim 40** is essentially claim 17 in the form of a computer readable storage medium and is rejected for the same reasons.

43.   **Claims 19 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub 2005/0033803) of record, hereinafter "Vleet", in view of Rivette et al. (US Patent 5,806,079) of record, hereinafter "Rivette", further in view of Darago et al. (US Patent 6,170,014) of record, hereinafter "Darago".**

44.   In regards to **claim 19**, Vleet and Rivette do not expressly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein replicating the structure and content of the desired portion of the data store comprises indicating a read-only status.

45.   Darago discloses replicating a database in a read-only format to another server in order to prevent users from modifying the replicated data, but still allow users to view it. Darago at col. 10, lines 66-7; col. 11, lines 1-4.

46.   Vleet, Rivette and Darago are analogous art because they are directed to the same field of endeavor of database management.

47.   At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined method of Vleet and Rivette by adding the feature of indicating a read-only status when replicating a desired portion of the data store, as taught by Darago.

48.   The motivation for doing so would have been because it prevents users from modifying the data on a target server or database, but still allows users to view the data. Darago at col. 10, lines 67; col. 11, lines 1-2.

49.   **Claim 42** is essentially claim 19 in the form of a computer readable storage medium and is rejected for the same reasons.

50.   **Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet et al. (US Patent Pub 2005/0033803) of record, hereinafter "Vleet", in view of Rivette et al. (US Patent 5,806,079) of record, hereinafter "Rivette", further in view of Fox (US Patent**

5,765,172) of record, further in view of Darago et al. (US Patent 6,170,014) of record,

hereinafter "Darago".

51.   In regards to **claim 47**, Vleet discloses a method comprising:

    a.   providing a database of stored events, wherein the events comprise data

describing user interactions with articles on the client device (Vleet at para. 0023), and

wherein the articles are associated with a plurality of different applications (Vleet at para.

0024, lines 14-22);

    b.   providing an index of the stored events (Vleet at para. 0026, lines 18-23).

    c.   providing a repository of at least a portion of content associated with the articles

(Vleet at para. 0026);

52.   Vleet does not expressly disclose (a) articles associated with a plurality of different client

applications, (b) identifying a desired portion of the database, index, and repository by presenting

a user with a graphical user interface, (c) the desired portion including articles relevant to a

search query, the identifying comprising: identifying a first result set of articles relevant to the

search query; identifying frequently occurring terms within the first result of articles; and

identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently occurring terms

(d) determining a checksum associated with the database, index, and repository, (e) determining

profile information associated with the database, index and repository, (f) replicating the

structure and content of the desired portion of the database, index, and repository to create a

replicated portion, (g) storing the replicated portion on a storage medium and (h) marking the

replicated portion as read-only. Vleet does disclose mirroring the data store, including the index,

to another storage medium. Vleet at para. 0034.

53.   Rivette discloses a database system that stores notes, which are indications of a user's

activity with articles (such a spreadsheets, documents, etc.,), that allows a user to select a portion

of the database to be replicated to another database. The portions can be searched based on

various criteria such as creator (profile information). Rivette at col. 21, lines 4-36. Rivette

discloses the feature where the user is permitted to search and identify note groupings, notes,

sub-notes, and data object portions. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9. Rivette discloses searching

capabilities of the system allowing a user to search for notes, subnotes, links and data objects.

Rivette at col. 24, lines 54-67. Rivette discloses the structure of notes and sub-notes. In

particular, Rivette discloses that sub-notes are created and defined by a user and that there can be

multiple sub-notes linked to a data object. Rivette at col. 12, lines 24-7. In addition, Rivette

discloses that a user can search for sub-notes. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9. Rivette discloses

allowing a user to search using multiple iteration or recursive search. Rivette at col. 36, lines 21-

6.

54.   Fox discloses determining a checksum value for a first database in order to verify the

integrity of a replicated database. Fox at col. 1, lines 65-7; col. 2, lines 1-6.

55.   Darago discloses replicating a database in a read-only format to another server in order to

prevent users from modifying the replicated data, but still allow users to view it. Darago at col.

10, lines 66-7; col. 11, lines 1-4.

56.   Vleet, Rivette, Fox and Darago are analogous art because they are directed to the same

field of endeavor of database management.

57.   At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to modify the method of Vleet by adding articles associated with a plurality of different client

applications and the steps of identifying a desired portion of the database, index, and repository by presenting a user with a graphical user interface, the desired portion including articles relevant to a search query, the identifying comprising: identifying a first result set of articles relevant to the search query; identifying frequently occurring terms within the first result of articles; and identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently occurring terms, determining profile information associated with the database, index and repository, replicating the structure and content of the desired portion of the database, index, and repository to create a replicated portion, and storing the replicated portion on a storage medium, as taught by Rivette.

58.   The motivation for doing so would have been because it is efficient to use portions of an existing database that may be relevant for another project at another database. Rivette at col. 21, lines 8-10.

59.   It further would have been obvious to modify the combined method of Vleet and Rivette by adding the step of determining a checksum associated with the database, index, and repository, as taught by Fox.

60.   The motivation for doing so would have been because determining checksums for replicated databases allows for ensuring data integrity after the replication. Fox at col. 1, lines 65-7.

61.   It would have further been obvious to modify the combined method of Vleet, Rivette and Fox by adding the step of marking the replicated portion as read-only, as taught by Darago.

62.   The motivation for doing so would have been because it prevents users from modifying

the data on a target server or database, but still allows users to view the data. Darago at col. 10,

lines 67; col. 11, lines 1-2.

63.   Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has been established as all the limitations

of claim 47 are met by the prior art, there is a suggestion/motivation to combine the references

and there is a reasonable expectation of success since the references are all in the field of

endeavor of database management.

Response to Arguments

Rejection of claims 1, 3-16, 18, 20-24, 26-46, 48 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

64.   Claims 13, 14, 36 and 37 are cancelled rendering the rejection to them moot.

65.   Applicant's remarks in regards to claims 40 and 42 are acknowledged. The rejection of

claims 40 and 42 should have been grouped with claims 17 and 19 respectively, due to their

similar limitations. However, due to a clerical error, claims 40 and 42 were grouped with the

majority of the claims. This error is corrected with this Final Office Action

66.   In the after final reply, Applicant argues the claims as amended. In particular, Applicant

amended independent claims 1, 24 and 47 to include limitations of cancelled claims 13, 14, 36

and 37. Applicant specifically presents arguments with respect to claim 1, however, the same

arguments apply to claims 24 and 47. The Examiner's arguments in response will also apply to

all the independent claims.

67.   Applicant's arguments in regards to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to claim 1, Applicant argues that the

combination of Vleet and Rivette fail to disclose "identifying a desired portion ... including articles relevant to a search query" and where the identifying comprises "identifying a first result set of articles relevant to the search query; identifying frequently occurring terms within the first result set of articles; and identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently occurring terms" (Remarks at 11.) The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

68.   The limitations at issue were previously rejected as claims 13 and 14 by the combination of Vleet and Rivette and mapped to portions of Rivette. Applicant has reproduced the cited portions in the Remarks and they are also repeated in the rejection above. Each limitation will not be discussed in turn.

69.   In regards to the limitation of "identifying a desired portion ... including articles relevant to a search query," col. 21, lines 26-9 of Rivette was cited. Rivette discloses the feature where the user is permitted to search and identify note groupings, notes, sub-notes, and data object portions. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9. The note groupings, notes, sub-notes and data object portions are interpreted as articles and they were identified as a result of a search. Therefore, they are relevant to a search query.

70.   In regards to the limitation of "identifying a first result set of articles relevant to the search query," col. 24, lines 54-67 of Rivette was cited. Rivette discloses searching capabilities of the system allowing a user to search for notes, subnotes, links and data objects. Rivette at col. 24, lines 54-67. By performing a search, the system is "identifying" a result set of articles relevant to the user's query.

71.   In regards to the limitation of "identifying frequently occurring items within the first result set of articles," col. 12, lines 14-27, col. 21, lines 26-9 and col. 24, lines 53-67 of Rivette

was cited. The cited portions will be explained in turn. Rivette discloses the structure of notes

and sub-notes. In particular, Rivette discloses that sub-notes are created and defined by a user

and that there can be multiple sub-notes linked to a data object. Rivette at col. 12, lines 24-7. In

addition, Rivette discloses that a user can search for sub-notes. Rivette at col. 21, lines 26-9.

The combination of these features is interpreted as "identifying frequently occurring terms within

the first result set of articles" because a user is searching (i.e., identifying) for multiple sub-notes

that link to a data object (i.e., frequently occurring terms) as the search result (i.e., within the first

result set of articles). The sub-notes are interpreted as "frequently occurring items" because a

user defines them and links them to a data object. In other words, a user must have accessed a

data object in order to link the sub-note to it. Since there can be multiple sub-notes linked to a

single data object and a user can search for sub-notes, it follows that a user can determine the

most frequently accessed data object by the number of sub-notes. Thus, Rivette discloses

identifying frequently occurring terms within the first result set of articles. Applicant argues that

Rivette is not concerned with identifying frequently occurring terms among the "results" of the

search (Remarks at 11.) However, it is interpreted that the identifying produces the first result

set and the previous limitation is only a partial step in returning the first result set.

72.   In regards to the limitation of "identifying a second result set of articles based at least in

part on the frequently occurring items," col. 36, lines 21-6 of Rivette was cited. Rivette discloses

allowing a user to search using multiple iteration or recursive search. Rivette at col. 36, lines 21-

6. As is known in the art, recursion utilizes the results of a previous step to proceed. Since

Rivette discloses the ability for a user to perform a recursive search, it is interpreted that the user

could perform a second search utilizing the sub-notes (i.e., frequently occurring terms) found in

the first result set. Thus, Rivette discloses identifying a second result set of articles based at least

in part on the frequently occurring terms.

73.   Accordingly, the combination of Vleet and Rivette disclose all the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 24 and 47 are also rejected for the same reasons.

74.   The dependent claims remain rejected due to their dependency and obviousness in view

of the prior art as set forth in the rejection above.

75.   Consequently, the rejection of claims 1, 3-12, 15-24, 26-35 and 38-49 under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) is maintained.

Conclusion

76.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

77.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

78.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7970. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs : 9:30am-6pm, Fri: 8am-4:30pm.

79.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

80.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Le
Art Unit 2163
December 13, 2007

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER